

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-49 have been examined, and have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**Preliminary Matters**

Applicant is submitting herewith 14 replacement sheets of formal drawings for Figs. 1-14. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to acknowledge acceptance of the formal drawings.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,579,223 to Raman ("Raman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,583,761 to Chou ("Chou").

**A. Claim 1**

Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references. For example, claim 1 recites that editing a first version in accordance with a first modification causes the second version to be edited in accordance with the second modification. The second version corresponds to the first version and the second modification corresponds to the first modification. Further, when the second version is edited in accordance with a third modification, the first version is automatically edited in accordance with a fourth modification, where the third modification corresponds to the fourth modification.

The above features are set forth in the non-limiting embodiment on pg. 9 of the present Application. For example, assume there is a German and Japanese language version. If the

German version is first edited, the Japanese version will also be edited. On the other hand, when a second edit is made (i.e., claimed third modification), and that edit is made to the Japanese version *first* (i.e., the claimed second version), the German version (i.e., claimed first version) will also be edited (i.e., vice versa via the claimed fourth modification).

The Examiner maintains that Raman discloses the method of editing multiple versions of information. However, Raman discloses that edits are *only* made to the “original” file, and that such edits are then made to a file that is translated from that original file (Fig. 2; col. 2, lines 12-15; col. 3, lines 50-65; col. 3, lines 39-41). The reference fails to teach or suggest that edits can be made to the translated file (i.e., the claimed second version), and that such edits will then be made to the original file (i.e., the claimed first version). In other words, there does not appear to be a bidirectional editing or modification.

In particular, in regard to Raman, assume the German file is the “original” file 201 and the Japanese file is the “translated” file 206, which is translated from the German file (Fig. 2). When the German file is modified, the Japanese file will be modified in accordance with the disclosed merge process. However, Raman fails to disclose that a user can make edits to the Japanese file, i.e., the translated file 206, and that such edits will be merged into the German file, i.e., the original file 201. All disclosure provided in Raman is directed only to the modification of the “original” file, and then subsequent modification of the translation, not vice versa or bidirectional (i.e., *See* col. 3, lines 39-41 and col. 7, lines 22-25).

In view of the above, Applicant submits that Raman fails to disclose the method of claim

1. In addition, since Chou fails to cure the deficient teachings of Raman, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

**B. Claims 2-11**

Since claims 2-11 are dependent upon claim 1, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

**C. Claims 12, 15, 24, 27, 36 and 39**

Since claims 12, 15, 24, 27, 36 and 39 contain features that are analogous to the features recited in claim 1, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable over the cited references for at least analogous reasons as presented above.

**D. Claims 13, 14, 16-23, 25, 26, 28-35, 37, 38 and 40-43**

Since claims 13, 14, 16-23, 25, 26, 28-35, 37, 38 and 40-43 are dependent upon one of claims 12, 15, 24, 27, 36 and 39, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

**E. Claim 44**

Applicant submits that claim 44 is patentable over the cited references. For example, claim 44 recites that the second language version of the textual information is not edited if the first modification is not compatible with the second language version.

The Examiner maintains that Raman discloses the above feature. However, Raman appears to disclose that the translated file 206 will always be modified when the original file 201 is modified, regardless of whether the edits are compatible with the translated file. For example, as set forth in col. 6, lines 20-63 of Raman, a search for an equivalent response is performed. However, a “crude” translation may be used. There is no disclosure that the translated file 206 will not be merged with the modified original file 202 if no equivalent response is found, i.e. where the modification of the original file is not compatible with the translated file.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that Raman fails to disclose the method of claim 44. In addition, since Chou fails to cure the deficient teachings of Raman, Applicant submits that claim 44 is patentable over the cited references.

**F. Claim 45**

Since claim 45 has been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer, and the features of claim 45 have been incorporated into claim 44, Applicant refers the Examiner to the arguments presented above.

**G. Claims 46 and 48**

Since claims 46 and 48 contain features that are analogous to the features recited in claim 44, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable over the cited references for at least analogous reasons as presented above.

**H. Claims 47 and 49**

Since claims 47 and 49 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer, and the features of claims 47 and 49 have been incorporated into claims 46 and 48, respectively, Applicant refers the Examiner to the arguments presented above.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No. 09/464,403

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER



Allison M. Tulino  
Registration No. 48,294

Date: December 29, 2004

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No. 09/464,403

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Applicant submits herewith 14 sheets of replacement formal drawings for Figs. 1-14.

Attachment: 14 Replacement Sheet